

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA – WESTERN DIVISION**

ST. LUKE SCHOOL OF MEDICINE;
DR. JERROLL B.R. DOLPHIN and
DR. ROBERT FARMER on behalf of
himself and all others similarly situated, as
applicable,

Plaintiffs,

v.

REPUBLIC OF LIBERIA; MINISTRY OF
HEALTH, a Liberian Governmental
Agency; MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, a
Liberian Governmental Agency; LIBERIAN
MEDICAL BOARD, a Liberian
Governmental Agency; NATIONAL
COMMISSION ON HIGHER
EDUCATION, a Liberian Governmental
Agency; NATIONAL TRANSITIONAL
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, a Liberian
Governmental Agency; DR. ISAAC
ROLAND; MOHAMMED SHERIFF; DR.
BENSON BARH; DR. GEORGE GOLLIN;
EDUCATION COMMISSION FOR
FOREIGN MEDICAL GRADUATES; a
Pennsylvania Non-Profit organization;
FOUNDATION FOR ADVANCEMENT
OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION
AND RESEARCH; a Pennsylvania Non-
Profit organization, UNIVERSITY OF
ILLINOIS-URBANA CHAMPAIGN, an
Illinois Institution of Higher Learning;
STATE OF OREGON, Office of Degree
Authorization,
Defendants.

Case No.: 10-CV-01791 RGK (SHx)

[Honorable R. Gary Klausner]

**[PROPOSED] ORDER RE
DEFENDANTS DR. GEORGE
GOLLIN'S AND THE BOARD OF
TRUSTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS' MOTION FOR
COSTS PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C.
§ 1919**

**[FILED CONCURRENTLY WITH
DEFENDANTS DR. GEORGE
GOLLIN'S AND THE BOARD OF
TRUSTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS' NOTICE OF
MOTION AND MOTION FOR
COSTS PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C.
§ 1919; AND DECLARATION OF
MICHAEL D. YOUNG]**

DATE: September 13, 2010
TIME: 9:00 a.m.
COURTROOM: 850

1 On September 13, 2010, the motion for costs pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1919
2 filed by defendants Dr. George Gollin and the Board of Trustees of the University of
3 Illinois came on regularly for hearing before this Court. After considering the papers
4 submitted in support of and opposition to defendants' motion and the evidence
5 contained therein, and having heard the argument of counsel thereon, and for good
6 cause shown,

7 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED as follows:

8 1. On July 29, 2010, this Court dismissed the instant action for want of
9 jurisdiction;

10 2. 28 U.S.C. § 1919 authorizes this Court to award defendants their
11 just costs whenever an action is dismissed for want of jurisdiction;

12 3. The costs sought by defendants have been shown to be just within
13 the meaning of 28 U.S.C. § 1919;

14 4. Accordingly, the Court awards defendants their costs in the amount
15 of \$ _____;

16 2. Defendants' motion for costs is granted.

17
18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19
20 DATED: _____

The Honorable R. Gary Klausner

1 Respectfully Submitted,

2
3 DATED: August 12, 2010 Respectfully Submitted

4 MICHAEL D. YOUNG
5 NICOLE C. RIVAS
6 **ALSTON & BIRD LLP**

7 /s/

8 _____
9 Michael D. Young
10 Attorneys for Defendant BOARD OF TRUSTEES
11 UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28